

# Review of: "Carl Friedrich's Path to "Totalitarianism""

Gabriela Guadalupe Valles Santillán<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The article follows a clear and precise methodology that historically allows the reader to form an idea or intellectual panorama about the premises defended by Carl Friedrich regarding totalitarianism and its distinction from other forms that manifest themselves in political regimes and from the democracy-authoritarianism binomial.

The bibliographic sources that support the information of the research work are accurate and sufficient. Methodological rigor is noted in the preparation of this manuscript.

Regarding the substance of the article, one of the characteristic notes alluding to Carl Friedrich is that he fought for the autonomy of political science, separating it from other branches such as history and philosophy and even from the legal theory. Regarding legal theory, the authors emphasize the differences between Carl Friedrich's position and the arguments put forward by Hans Kelsen, who is considered one of the most notable legal theorists of the Twentieth Century and who contrasted, in his perspective of legal positivism, authoritarian versus democratic state types supported by the rule of law.

Turner's article also highlights the opposition shown by Carl Friedrich to national socialism and the arrival of Adolf Hitler, and his reflection on the benefits of the Constitutional and Democratic State. Another distinctive note in the substance of the manuscript is the insistence that Carl Friedrich was a promoter of community democracy, as opposed to that democracy that emphasizes the individual and the individual freedom. The article explains very well how Friedrich is in favor of a discretionary State based on normative supremacy. These notes allow the reader to easily distinguish and understand Carl Friedrich's theory as it is opposed to liberalism and the formalist legal positivism predominant in the Twentieth Century.

It is important to mention that the article highlights Carl Friedrich's characterization of totalitarian regimes, confronting these characteristics with those that could be confused with authoritarian regimes, and with those characteristics that can also occur at a given moment in decadent or imperfect democracies.

In conclusion, I recommend this article because it is very didactic and informative, and it is easy to understand for students of law or political science.